

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	: John F. Malitzis	Art Unit	: 3693
Serial No.	: 10/040,912	Examiner	: Sara M. Chandler
Filed	: January 7, 2002	Conf. No.	: 3822
Title	: AUTOMATED MARKET SYSTEM WITH SELECTABLE MATCH-OFF OF ORDER FLOW		

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

The Appeal Brief fee has already been paid. Please apply any other charges or credits to
Deposit Account No. **06-1050**.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EFS-WEB FILING

I hereby certify that this paper was filed with the Patent and Trademark
Office using the EFS-WEB system on this date: March 06, 2009

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is The NASDAQ OMX Group, Inc.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The Appellant is not aware of any appeals or interferences related to the above-identified patent application.

(3) Status of Claims

This is an appeal from the decision of the Examiner in a Non-Final Office Action dated **February 24, 2009**. Claims 1-14 and 17-19 are pending in the application. Claims 15 and 16 were cancelled. Claims 1-14 and 17-19 stand rejected.

Claims 1-14 and 17-19 are the subject of this appeal.

(4) Status of Amendments

Appellant filed a Reply to the Final Office Action of October 31, 2007, amending claims 1, 2, 8, 12 and 13. The amendments from the Reply to the Final Office Action have been entered. Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal on **January 29, 2008**. Appellant received a Notice of Abandonment on June 6, 2008. Appellant's Petition to Revive was granted on **August 15, 2008**. Appellant filed an Appeal Brief on October 30, 2008 and **November 18, 2008**.

In response to the Appeal Brief, Appellant received a Non-Final Office Action on **February 24, 2009**.

Appellant filed a new Notice of Appeal on **February 25, 2009**, appealing from that decision.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Claim 1

One aspect of Appellant's invention is set out in claim 1 as a computer implemented method of processing an order in an electronic-based trading system. "[An] *electronic market*

10 includes client systems 12 that access a central quote/order collector facility 20.”¹ “The client systems 12 include a processor, memory and a storage device, e.g., a client workstation or personal computer (all not shown) that can include a client process to enter quotes/orders into the electronic market system 10. ”²

Inventive features of claim 1 include receiving an order to buy or sell a product, the order having a market participant identification. “...MMA sends system 20 all of its quotes/orders...”³ “[Process] 25 will examine 67a the identification of the order...”⁴

Inventive features of claim 1 also include, for the order, checking the order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system. “*The order execution/routing manager 26d receives 82 an order and examines 84 the value of field 17i (FIG. 1B) of the order to check if the market participant had specified the anti-internalization qualifier property for the order.*”⁵ “...[I]nternalize execution manager 26c matches-off a participant's agency or proprietary orders against that participant's quotes/order before the order is sent for time/price priority execution in the quote/order collector facility 20. For example, if MMA sends system 20 all of its quotes/orders and is at the best bid of \$20 showing 4,000 shares (attributable and non-attributable), and the MMA sends OCF 25 a 1,000 share market sell order from one its customers, [process] 25 will examine 67a the identification of the order and if it matches the identification of the market participant who is at the best bid or offer for that security, the [process] 25 will execute 67b the order against the participant's own quote, thus matching off the order on behalf of the participant.”⁶

¹ Specification, Page 3, Lines 18-20

² *Id.*, Page 3, Lines 25-28

³ *Id.*, Page 11, Line 27

⁴ *Id.*, Page 11, Line 30 – Page 12, Line 1

⁵ *Id.*, Page 12, Lines 26-29

⁶ *Id.*, Page 11, Line 23 – Page 12, Line 5

Inventive features of claim 1 further include satisfying the order according to whether or not the market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of internalization execution. ***“If the anti-internalization qualifier property is set the order execution manager will by-pass calling the internalize execution manager 26c and instead will execute the order according to a specified priority, if any. If the anti-internalization qualifier property is not set the order execution manager will call 86 the internalize execution manager 26c.”***⁷

Claim 7

Another aspect of Appellant's invention is set out in claim 7 as a networked computer system for providing an electronic-based market system. ***“...[A]n electronic market 10 is shown. The electronic market 10 includes client systems 12 that access a central quote/order collector facility 20. The quote/order collector facility 20 includes one or preferably a plurality of server computers generally denoted as 22 including a processor 22a, main memory 22b and storage 22c.***

Inventive features of claim 7 include one or more networked computers to receive orders and match orders against quotes posted in the system on a time priority basis. ***“The order collector process 25 also includes an internal execution process manager 26c to match off executions for quoting market participants at the best bid/offer.”***⁸ ***“...[I]nternalize execution manager 26c matches-off a participant's agency or proprietary orders against that participant's quotes/order before the order is sent for time/price priority execution in the quote/order collector facility 20.”***⁹

Inventive features of claim 7 also include one or more networked computers to check if a market participant identification associated with a received order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system. ***“The order collector process 25 also includes an internal execution process manager 26c to match off executions for quoting market participants at the best bid/offer.”***¹⁰

⁷ Specification, Page 12, Line 29 – Page 13, Line 5

⁸ Id., Page 7, Lines 23-25

⁹ Id., Page 11, Lines 23-26

¹⁰ Id., Page 7, Lines 23-25

Inventive features of claim 7 further include one or more networked computers to check if the market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of the internalization execution for the order in the market system where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order where the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system. ***“The order execution/routing manager 26d receives 82 an order and examines 84 the value of field 17i (FIG. 1B) of the order to check if the market participant had specified the anti-internalization qualifier property for the order.”***¹¹ ***“...[I]nternalize execution manager 26c matches-off a participant's agency or proprietary orders against that participant's quotes...For example, if MMA sends system 20 all of its quotes/orders and is at the best bid of \$20 showing 4,000 shares (attributable and non-attributable), and the MMA sends OCF 25 a 1,000 share market sell order from one its customers, [process] 25 will examine 67a the identification of the order and if it matches the identification of the market participant who is at the best bid or offer for that security, the [process] 25 will execute 67b the order against the participant's own quote, thus matching off the order on behalf of the participant.”***¹²

Inventive features of claim 7 still further include one or more networked computers to match the order with quotes in the system according to whether the order is qualified for avoidance of the internalization execution. ***“If the anti-internalization qualifier property is set the order execution manager will by-pass calling the internalize execution manager 26c and instead will execute the order according to a specified priority, if any. If the anti-internalization qualifier property is not set the order execution manager will call 86 the internalize execution manager 26c.”***¹³

Claim 12

A further aspect of Appellant's invention is set out in claim 12 as a computer program product residing on a computer readable medium for operating an electronic based trading

¹¹ Specification, Page 12, Lines 26-29

¹² Id., Page 11, Line 23 – Page 12, Line 5

¹³ Id., Page 12, Line 29 – Page 13, Line 5

system. “[An] electronic market 10 includes client systems 12 that access a central quote/order collector facility 20.”¹⁴ “The client systems 12 include a processor, memory and a storage device...”¹⁵ “The storage system 22c includes quote/order collector process 25 that is executed in memory 22b.”¹⁶

Inventive features of claim 12 include instructions for causing a computer to receive an order from a market participant's customer. “A broker/dealer can receive an order from a customer. The broker/dealer can send that order to the order collector facility 20 to be executed with quotes that are posted by electronic communication networks, market makers or other markets... [A]n entry screen 17 for non-directed order entry is shown. The screen 17 allows a participant to enter non-directed orders and would generally include fields 17a-17e for entering information including price, amount, and also three type fields.”¹⁷

Inventive features of claim 12 also include instructions for causing a computer to, for the order, check if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution in the electronic based trading system where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system ““The order execution/routing manager 26d receives 82 an order and examines 84 the value of field 17i (FIG. 1B) of the order to check if the market participant had specified the anti-internalization qualifier property for the order.”¹⁸ “...[I]nternalize execution manager 26c matches-off a participant's agency or proprietary orders against that participant's quotes/order before the order is sent for time/price priority execution in the quote/order collector facility 20. For example, if MMA sends system 20 all of its quotes/orders and is at the best bid of \$20 showing 4,000 shares (attributable and non-attributable), and the MMA sends OCF 25 a 1,000 share market sell order from one its customers, [process] 25 will examine 67a the identification of the order and if it matches the identification of the market participant who is at the best bid or

¹⁴ Specification, Page 3, Lines 18-20

¹⁵ Id., Page 3, Lines 25-28

¹⁶ Id., Page 4, Lines 9-10

¹⁷ Id., Page 5, Lines 19-27

¹⁸ Id., Page 12, Lines 26-29

offer for that security, the [process] 25 will execute 67b the order against the participant's own quote, thus matching off the order on behalf of the participant."¹⁹

Inventive features of claim 12 further include instructions for causing a computer to, for the order, match the order according to whether or not the market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of internalization execution. *"If the anti-internalization qualifier property is set the order execution manager will by-pass calling the internalize execution manager 26c and instead will execute the order according to a specified priority, if any. If the anti-internalization qualifier property is not set the order execution manager will call 86 the internalize execution manager 26c."*²⁰

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Claims 1, 2-6, 12-14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

2. Claims 7-11, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, as being of undue breadth.

3. Claims 1-14 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Appellants regard as their invention.

4. Claims 1, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements or omitting essential steps.

5. Claims 1-14, 17, and 18 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-14, and 16-20 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 09/404,518, with corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161687 ("Serkin").

6. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Market Fragmentation," by Hans R. Stoll. Financial Markets Research

¹⁹ Specification, Page 11, Line 23 – Page 12, Line 5

²⁰ Id., Page 12, Line 29 – Page 13, Line 5

Center Policy Paper No 00-11. Vanderbilt University. April 28, 2000. Current Version:
September 5, 2000 ("Stoll"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,136,501 ("Silverman").

7. Claims 2, 8, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoll in view of Silverman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,472,087 ("Keith").

8. Claims 4, 5, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoll in view of Silverman and Keith, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,707 ("Katz").

9. Claims 1-14 and 17-19 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Serkin.

(7) Argument

Anticipation

"It is well settled that anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the presence in a single reference of all of the elements of a claimed invention." *Ex parte Chopra*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 230, 231 (BPA&I 1985) and cases cited.

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of all elements of a claimed invention arranged as in the claim." *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 220 U.S.P.Q. 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

"This court has repeatedly stated that the defense of lack of novelty (i.e., 'anticipation') can only be established by a single prior art reference which discloses each and every element of the claimed invention." *Structural Rubber Prod. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1270 (Fed. Cir. 1984), citing five prior Federal Circuit decisions since 1983 including *Connell*.

In a later analogous case the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit again applied this rule in reversing a denial of a motion for judgment n.o.v. after a jury finding that claims were anticipated. *Jamesbury Corp. v. Litton Industrial Prod., Inc.*, 225 U.S.P.Q. 253 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

After quoting from *Connell*, "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of all elements of a claimed invention arranged as in the claim," 225 U.S.P.Q. at 256, the court observed that the patentee accomplished a constant tight contact in a ball valve by a lip

on the seal or ring which interferes with the placement of the ball. The lip protruded into the area where the ball will be placed and was thus deflected after the ball was assembled into the valve. Because of this constant pressure, the patented valve was described as providing a particularly good seal when regulating a low pressure stream. The court quoted with approval from a 1967 Court of Claims decision adopting the opinion of then Commissioner and later Judge Donald E. Lane:

[T]he term "engaging the ball" recited in claims 7 and 8 means that the lip contacts the ball with sufficient force to provide a fluid tight seal ***** The Saunders flange or lip only sealingly engages the ball 1 on the upstream side when the fluid pressure forces the lip against the ball and never sealingly engages the ball on the downstream side because there is no fluid pressure there to force the lip against the ball. The Saunders sealing ring provides a compression type of seal which depends upon the ball pressing into the material of the ring. *** The seal of Saunders depends primarily on the contact between the ball and the body of the sealing ring, and the flange or lip sealingly contacts the ball on the upstream side when the fluid pressure increases. 225 U.S.P.Q. at 258.

Relying on *Jamesbury*, the ITC said, "Anticipation requires looking at a reference, and comparing the disclosure of the reference with the claims of the patent in suit. A claimed device is anticipated if a single prior art reference discloses all the elements of the claimed invention as arranged in the claim." *In re Certain Floppy Disk Drives and Components Thereof*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 982, 985 (U.S. ITC 1985).

Obviousness

"It is well established that the burden is on the PTO to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness, *In re Fritsch*, 972 F.2d. 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (C.C.P.A., 1972)."

In *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, (2007), the Supreme Court reversed a decision by the Court of Appeal's for the Federal Circuit decision that reversed a summary judgment of obviousness on the ground that the district court had not adequately identified a motivation to combine two prior art references. The invention was a combination of

a prior art repositionable gas pedal, with prior art electronic (rather than mechanical cable) gas pedal position sensing. The Court first rejected the “rigid” teaching suggestion motivation (TSM) requirement applied by the Federal Circuit, since the Court’s obviousness decisions had all advocated a “flexible” and “functional” approach that cautioned against “granting a patent based on the combination of elements found in the prior art.”

With respect to the genesis of the TSM requirement, the Court noted that although “As is clear from cases such as *Adams*²¹, a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art. Although common sense directs one to look with care at a patent application that claims as innovation the combination of two known devices according to their established functions, it can be important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does. This is so because inventions in most, if not all, instances rely upon building blocks long since uncovered, and claimed discoveries almost of necessity will be combinations of what, in some sense, is already known.”

In application of the TSM requirement, the Court cautioned that: “Helpful insights, however, need not become rigid and mandatory formulas; and when it is so applied, the TSM test is incompatible with our precedents.”

"The mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." *In re Gordon*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Although the Commissioner suggests that [the structure in the primary prior art reference] could readily be modified to form the [claimed] structure, "[t]he mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." *In re Laskowski*, 10 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1397, 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

"The claimed invention must be considered as a whole, and the question is whether there is something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of

²¹ *United States v. Adams*, 383 U. S. 39, 40 (1966)

making the combination." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 488 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under Section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis in original, footnotes omitted).

"The critical inquiry is whether 'there is something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination.'" *Fromson v. Advance Offset Plate, Inc.*, 225 U.S.P.Q. 26, 31 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

(1) Claims 1, 2-6, 12-14, and 17 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 1 and 2-6

The examiner contends:

In order for a method to be considered a "process" under 101, a claimed process must either: (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials). *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385, 1391 and 1396 (2008).

The method recited in claim 1 is clearly tied to a computer as required by *Bilski* ("...checking the order in a computer.."). Accordingly, the claims are directed to statutory subject matter because they are tied to a particular machine, a computer (claim 1), one or more networked computers (claim 7) a computer readable medium (claim 12).

Claims 12-14 and 17

The examiner contends:

The claim preamble recites "A computer program product.. ..." Software per se is not patent eligible subject matter and is not one of the four

enumerated categories of patent eligible subject matter. Applicant should rewrite the preamble of claim 1 to recite, "A computer readable medium comprising a plurality of computer readable program codes" etc. and indicating that they are executable etc. Each limitation in the body of the claim should be clearly directed towards executable code. Similarly, the dependent claims should recite a "computer readable medium "

Appellants disagree. The computer program product of claim 12 is clearly tied to a computer readable medium. This is a so called Beauregard claim that was sanctioned by the Federal Circuit and the Office²² in response to *In re Lowry*.²³

(2) Claims 7-11, 18, and 19 are not of undue breadth under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph.

The examiner contends:

Re Claim 7: A "single means" claim, i.e. where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element or means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. See *In re Hyatt*, 218 USPQ 195, (CAFC 1983) and MPEP 2164.08(a).

The preamble of claim 7 suggests that it is directed to a "A networked computer system" however, the body of the claim only recites one structural means (i.e., "one or more networked computers"). A system claim cannot be comprised entirely of a single means or element.

Appellants disagree. A single means claim is a claim "where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means[.]"²⁴ The MPEP specifies that "a claim element that does not include the phrase 'means for' or 'step for' will not be considered to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph."²⁵ Claim 7 is directed to a networked computer system that includes: "one or more networked computers to, receive orders ... check if a market participant identification ... check if the market participant has qualified the order ... and match the order"

²² See 1184 O.G. 87 Feb. 26, 1996

²³ *In re Lowry* 32 F.3d 1579, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

²⁴ See MPEP 2164.08(a).

²⁵ See MPEP 2181(I).

Thus, claim 7 does not invoke means-plus-function under 35 U.S.C. § 112 at least because the claim does not recite any “means for” language, but rather recites a structural element, namely one or more computers.

(3) Claims 1-14 and 17-19 are not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph.

Claims 1, 7, and 12

The examiner contends that

Claims 1, 7 and 12 recite the limitations "electronic-based trading" and "product." Currently the claimed invention is not specific to securities trading and the trading of financial products (e.g., securities). Presently the claimed invention could be electronic trading, electronic auctions, e-shopping and similar electronic markets. Furthermore, the products traded could be any products or services.²⁶

Appellant contends that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Appellant regards as their invention.

Appellant claims “A computer implemented method of processing an order in an electronic-based trading system, the method comprises ...” The examiner has not shown how or why this subject matter is indefinite. The examiner appears to question the breath of the claims without the benefit of any prior art reference. Claims are written to a person of skill in the art and it is incumbent upon the examiner to point out with particularity the alleged errors in the claim that would prevent that person from ascertaining the scope of the claims.

Clearly Appellant desires that these claims be limited to products and electronic based trading. The test for definiteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is whether “those skilled in the art would understand what is claimed when the claim is read in light of the specification.”²⁷ The examiner has not applied such a test to the claims. Rather, the examiner appears to use an indefiniteness rejection in an improper attempt to force Appellant to narrow the scope of the claims without any prior art reference requiring such a narrowing of claim scope. It

²⁶ Final Office Action, Mail Date 31 October 2007, Page 5

²⁷ *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565, 1576, 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

is not the role of the claims to enable one skilled in the art to reproduce the invention, but rather to define the legal metes and bounds of the invention.²⁸

Therefore, claims 1, 7, and 12 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Appellant regard as their²⁹ invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, and 14

The examiner contends that:

[c]laims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14 recite the limitations "the best bid or best offer price" or "the best bid or best offer." There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.³⁰

and

[c]laims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14 recite the limitations "best bid or best offer price" or "best bid or best offer." The meaning intended by Applicant for the terms are unclear. For purposes of claim interpretation, best bid or best offer is interpreted as the most suitable, useful or desirable bid or offer.³¹

Appellant contends that sufficient antecedent basis exists in claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, and 14 for the phrase: "best bid or best offer price" because at any point in time there is but one best bid or best offer price as that term is known to one skilled in the art.

While the examiner may be suggesting that Appellant change "the" to "a" to introduce the feature of "a best bid/offer", Appellant contends that such a change, while part of normal claim drafting when dealing with non-unique items, in this instance would be confusing because there is but one "best" bid or one "best" offer price that is constantly changing. One of skill in this art would understand the phrase the "best bid / best offer." However, because there is but one, (depending on how that is defined in the trading system, e.g. a national best bid/best offer or a trading system best bid best offer) to instead recite "a best bid or a best offer" could infer that there were more than one, which would be confusing.

²⁸ *In re Geoffe*, 526 F.2d 1393, 1397, 188 U.S.P.Q. 131, (CCPA, 1975).

²⁹ 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph refers to the personal pronoun "his" not the definite article "the," as used by the examiner. For multiple inventors the plural personal pronoun "their" should be read into this section, not the definite article "the."

³⁰ Final Office Action, Mail Date 31 October 2007, Page 5

³¹ Id.

The examiner also contends that

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14 recite the limitation "priority." The meaning intended by Applicant for the term is unclear. For purposes of claim interpretation, priority/prioritize is interpreted as- to arrange or deal with in order of importance.³²

The meaning of priority is clear from its use in the claims and clearly the specification can be consulted by the examiner if the examiner is confused. Priority is directed to how the system ranks orders for execution, e.g., based on, e.g., price, time and size. In some implementations there are several potential priorities and the order determines the priority by which the order interacts with other trading interest in the system.

As described in Appellant's specification:

Referring to FIG. 1B, an entry screen 17 for non-directed order entry is shown. The screen 17 allows a participant to enter non-directed orders and would generally include fields 17a-17e for entering information including price, amount, and also three type fields. The type fields 17c-17e determine how the order interacts in the execution/routing manager 26d against Quoting Market Participant's contra-side quotes/orders. The type fields choose a priority, e.g., price/time box 17c; or price/size/time box 17d; or price/time that accounts for ECN access fees box 17e."³³

Again, the examiner has not pointed out any inconsistencies or confusion in the claims and the specification is available to the examiner to assist in interpretation of the word "priority." Therefore, claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, and 14 are proper under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 2

The examiner questions:

Claim 2 recites "matching-off the order without regard to a priority of other quotes in the system". Since claim 3 depends from claim 2, doesn't

³² Final Office Action, Mail Date 31 October 2007, Page 5

³³ Specification, Page 5, Line 23 – Page 6, Line 2.

"without regard to priority" already encompass "without regard to time priority."?³⁴

Claim 2 limits claim 1, and covers the situation when a market participant has not qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution. In that instance, "matching-off" of the order occurs against the quote of the matching market participant without regard to a priority of other quotes in the electronic-based trading system.

Claims 2 and 13

The examiner questions:

Regarding the "best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of the market" in claims 2 and 13, is that the same as the best bid or best offer price on the opposite side of the market since other grounds for giving other quotes "priority" (e.g., time) are not considered?³⁵

Appellant responds that for a given market at a given time, e.g., a market in securities such as stocks, there is a bid price that is the highest price that a market maker or specialist would buy a security and an offer price or the lowest that the market maker or specialist would sell the security. So, there indeed exists a best bid/best offer price. However, in a system, there may be many quotes, orders at the best bid and best offer prices, but generally only one of the quotes or orders will be the either oldest and of largest size or of largest size and oldest (depending on the priority scheme employed). A similar situation holds for offers.

Claim 8

The examiner questions:

Regarding the "best bid or best offer" in claim 8, is this best bid or best offer a function of price and time on the opposite side of the market since other grounds for giving other quotes "priority" are not considered?³⁶

Appellant responds by referring the examiner to the explanation *supra*.

³⁴ Final Office Action, Mail Date 31 October 2007, Page 6

³⁵ Id.

³⁶ Id.

The examiner rejected claims 2-6, 8-11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph on the same rationale as the claims from which they depend. For the same reasons as explained above, Appellant requests that the rejection of claims 1-14, and 17-19 be withdrawn.³⁷

(4) Claims 1, 7, and 12 are not incomplete under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph.

The examiner contends that

A best bid or best offer is achieved after performing a step of prioritizing or ranking based on some condition or conditions (e.g., price). This step is missing from the claimed invention.³⁸

Claims 1, 7, and 12 recite "...internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system *regardless of the priority of that quote* in the system..." [Emphasis added] The emphasized phrase requires that a priority exists in the market, upon which to base the best bid or the best offer. A positive step of establishing a priority however is not needed to distinguish these claims over the prior art and indeed if recited could prevent direct infringement of these claims by a single actor. A requirement of a priority existing in the system is not missing from claims 1, 7, and 12, but the action of establishing that priority is neither necessary to an understanding of the invention nor needed to distinguish over the prior art.

The examiner further contends that "**Applicant is using conditional language but, has not accounted for what happens for all conditions.**"³⁹ Claims 1, 7 and 12 recite: "...checking the order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system...". Appellant contends that claims 1, 7, and 12 are "complete" in that the claims distinguish over the cited art.

³⁷ The examiner failed to mention claims 17-19 explicitly in this rejection. Appellant assumes that claims 17-19 are included in the rejection, as they depend from rejected independent claims.

³⁸ Final Office Action, Mail Date 31 October 2007, Page 7

³⁹ Id.

The claims do not need to present a consequence of an alternative state of the claimed condition in order to clearly state the invention. That is, the novelty of Appellant's invention lies with what follows if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system. What happens if the market participant has not qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order is not needed to distinguish Appellant's invention over the prior art. The examiner fails to accept the well-established principle that it is the role of the claims to define the subject matter that Appellant considers to be his invention.⁴⁰

The examiner questions:

How the pool of bids or offers (i.e., serving as the basis for determining the best bid or best offer price) entered the system is unclear. Are they bids or offers obtained from other systems? Are they bids or offers entered in the claimed system. Is the pool national, system specific'?⁴¹

Appellant responds that Appellant has not recited "pools." Accordingly, Appellant is unable to respond to this comment. The bids or offers may be either national or system specific.

The examiner further questions:

How are the orders satisfied? Would the order be satisfied in the same way if the order is qualified and if the order is not qualified? If not, what is the difference? How are the orders matched? Would the order be matched in the same way if the order is qualified and if the order is not qualified? If not, what is the difference? What is the difference between "satisfying" in claim 1 and "matching" in claims 7 and 12.⁴²

The meaning of "satisfying" an order in claim 1 is known in the art and is contained in the specification:

The system 20 has a default, e.g., a strict price/time priority. If a market participant does not override the default or selects price/time 94, (FIG. 6A) a Non-Directed Order would be executed 96 first against all displayed quotes/order of market makers, ECNs, and non-attributable agency orders of UTP Exchanges,

⁴⁰ *In re Geoffe*, supra.

⁴¹ Final Office Action, Mail Date 31 October 2007, page 7

⁴² Id.

in time priority between such interest. If the order is not satisfied 98 at that level of priority the order will execute 100 against the reserve size of market makers and ECNs in time priority between such interest. If the order still is not satisfied 102, (FIG. 6B) the order will execute 104 against principal quotes of UTP Exchanges, in time priority between such interest.⁴³

The meaning of “matching off” and order in claims 7 and 12 is known in the art and is contained in the specification:

...if MMA {Market Maker} sends system 20 all of its quotes/orders and is at the best bid of \$20 showing 4,000 shares (attributable and non-attributable), and the MMA sends OCF [Order Collector Facility] 25 a 1,000 share market sell order from one its customers, OCP [Order Collector Process] 25 will examine 67a the identification of the order and if it matches the identification of the market participant who is at the best bid or offer for that security, the OCP 25 will execute 67b the order against the participant's own quote, thus matching off the order on behalf of the participant.”⁴⁴

Claims 1, 7 and 12 neither omit essential elements nor omit essential steps. It is not the role of the claims to enable one skilled in the art to reproduce the invention, but rather to define the legal metes and bounds of the invention.⁴⁵ This has been attained by Appellant's claims and Appellant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 1, 7, and 12 be reversed.

The examiner rejected claims 2-6, 8-11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph on the same rationale as the claims from which they depend. For the same reasons as explained above, Appellant requests that the rejection of claims 2-6, 8-11, 13, and 14 be withdrawn.

(5) Claims 1-14, 17, and 18 are not obvious on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 3-14, and 16-20 of Serkin.

The examiner contends that

⁴³Specification, Page 13, Lines 14-25.

⁴⁴ Specification, Page 11, Line 27 – Page 12, Line 5.

⁴⁵ See Ref. 24.

[c]laims 1-14 and 17-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,3-14 and 16-20 of copending Application No. 09/404,518. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications are drawn to:

**Executing an order in a market system comprising:
receiving an order from a market participant; and matching-off off the order against the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of the market.⁴⁶**

Appellant contends that the claims in Serkin do not recite "...checking the order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system *regardless of the priority of that quote in the system...*" [Emphasis added], as required by claims 1-14, 17, and 18.

Rather, claim 1 of Serkin recites: "...checking if a market participant identification associated with the order from the customer matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system which is at a best bid or best offer price in the system; and if the market participant identification matches the market participant identification representing a best bid or offer quote in the system..."

The examiner has not shown therefore that the claims are an obvious variant of Serkin and therefore, this rejection is improper and should be reversed. Moreover, no time-wise extension of the Serkin patent would result from issuance of a patent in the present application. The Serkin patent does not require the use of the invention claimed in the present application, and the present claims do not prevent exercise of the invention claimed in Serkin. Thus, if the ownership interests in Serkin and the present application were bi-furcated a third party, upon expiration of Serkin could practice the Serkin invention free and clear of the present application and *vice versa*.

⁴⁶ Final Office Action, Mail Date 31 October 2007, Page 8

(6) Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, and 17-19 are allowable over Stoll in view of Silverman

The examiner contends:

Stoll discloses a computer implemented method of processing an order in a electronic-based trading system...avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system...(Stoll, pgs. 1-13, particularly pgs. 4-11);... Stoll fails to explicitly disclose: checking the order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order and satisfying the order according to whether or not the market participant has qualified the order.

Silverman discloses checking the order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order (Silverman, abstract, col. 3, lines 18 - 38) and satisfying the order according to whether or not the market participant has qualified the order (Silverman, abstract, col. 3, lines 18 - 38).

The examiner's reasoning is procedural improper because it fails to give proper notice of the basis for the rejection.

Appellant points out to the Board that Stoll is 13 pages long, including title, abstract, and endnotes, leaving pages 4-11 as the entire body. The examiner however improperly fails to point out any specific passage in Stoll that reads on the features of claim 1. Appellant notes that, in the Advisory Action of February 11, 2008, in response to the Reply to the Final Office Action of October 31, 2007, the examiner has merely responded to Appellant's arguments as "merely rehashing", without explaining what "rehashing" means.

Appellant contends that this rejection is procedurally improper.

37 C.F.R. § 1.104 states:

The applicant, or in the case of a reexamination proceeding, both the patent owner and the requester, will be notified of the examiner's action. The reasons for any adverse action or any objection or requirement will be stated in an Office action and such information or references will be given *as may be useful in aiding the applicant, or in the case of a reexamination*

proceeding the patent owner, to judge the propriety of continuing the prosecution.⁴⁷

In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, *the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable*. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.⁴⁸

Further:

The process of patent examination is an interactive one ... The examiner cannot sit mum, leaving the applicant to shoot arrows into the dark hoping to somehow hit a secret objection harbored by the examiner. The 'prima facie case' notion, the exact origin of which appears obscure ..., seemingly was intended to leave no doubt among examiners that they must state clearly and specifically any objections (the prima facie case) to patentability, and give the applicant fair opportunity to meet those objections with evidence and argument. To that extent the concept serves to level the playing field and reduces the likelihood of administrative arbitrariness.⁴⁹

Moreover, according to the United States Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit: “[35 U.S.C. § 132] is violated when a rejection is so uninformative that it prevents the applicant from recognizing and seeking to counter the grounds for rejection.”⁵⁰

Accordingly, on this basis alone the Board should reverse the examiner.

The alleged combination of references fail to suggest several features of the claims.

Claims 1, 7 and 12

For the purpose of this appeal only Claims 1, 7 and 12 stand or fall together. Claim 1 is representative of this group of claims.

Stoll neither describes nor suggests “...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the

⁴⁷ 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(a)(2), emphasis added

⁴⁸ 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2), emphasis added

⁴⁹ *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1449 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

⁵⁰ *Chester v. Miller*, 906 F.2d 1574, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1990)

order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system...”

Rather, Stoll states:

Brokers that internalize or preference order flow achieve best price by agreeing to send the order to a market maker that promises to match the best price when the order is presented. In other words, a market maker may never post the best price and yet receive designated order flow.

Excessive preferencing or internalization can harm markets. If all order flow were preferenced or internalized, no market maker would have an incentive to narrow the spread to attract orders because a better price would simply be matched by other market makers and would fail to attract additional orders.⁵¹

While Stoll mentions the concept of internalization, and possible consequences for markets, Stoll neither describes nor suggests “...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system ...,” as recited in claim 1.

In fact, Stoll describes a different solution to the problem of excessive internalization:

A middle ground between matching the best price and strict price-time priority is a requirement to route orders to the market posting the best price.⁵²

Therefore, Stoll in fact teaches away from the cited features of claim 1.

Silverman fails to remedy the deficiencies of Stoll. Silverman was introduced by the examiner to cover the features of checking the order in a computer to determine if a market

⁵¹ Stoll, Page 6, Lines 2-10.

⁵² Stoll, Page 7, Lines 1-2

participant has qualified the order and satisfying the order according to whether or not the market participant has qualified the order. However, Silverman neither describes nor suggests “...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system...,” as recited in claim 1.

Rather, in the cited passage, Silverman describes a system in which real time prices of trading instruments for which bids are matched are subject to real time credit controls. Such controls can inhibit matching transactions which do not satisfy a credit limit:

A matching system for trading instruments is provided in which bids are automatically matched against offers for given trading instruments for automatically providing matching transactions in order to complete trades for the given trading instruments such as foreign exchange currencies, in which real time prices are subject to real time credit controls to anonymously block or inhibit the completion of potential matching transactions which do not satisfy an anonymous gross counterparty credit limit. Each of the keystations or client sites in the system assigns trading party credit limits to the other client sites in the system with which it is desired to trade, with these trading party credit limits being maintained anonymously by the host computer and being used by the host computer to anonymously determine gross counterparty credit limits for each potential matching transaction. The gross counterparty credit limit for a given potential matching transaction is the minimum of the trading party credit limits for each of the counterparties involved in the potential matching transaction.⁵³

In Silverman, credit limits of trading parties are used to qualify a potential matching transaction (“real time prices are subject to real time credit controls to anonymously block or inhibit the completion of potential matching transactions which do not satisfy an anonymous gross counterparty credit limit”). Nowhere does Silverman describe or suggest avoidance of credit controls or any such action, never mind an internalization execution as recited in claim 1.

⁵³ Silverman, Column 3, Lines 18-38

Stoll or Silverman, alone or in combination, neither describe nor suggest "...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system..." as recited in claim 1.

Claims 6, 11 and 14

For the purpose of this appeal only Claims 6, 11 and 14 stand or fall together. Claim 6 is representative of this group of claims.

Stoll neither describes nor suggests at least the feature of "...matching the order to a order of a market participant that has the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for the product... if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution." Rather, Stoll states in the passage quoted above that orders should be required to be routed to the market posting the best price. This again teaches away from the feature in claim 6 that matches an order (as opposed to routing of the order to another market) with that of a market participant that has the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for the product.

Silverman fails to remedy the deficiencies of Stoll. The examiner contends:

Silverman further discloses...matching the order to a order of a market participant that has the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for the product (Silverman, abstract, col. 1, lines 18-26, col. 3, line 18+ - col. 4, line 26; col. 6, lines 22-65; col. 8, line 65+ - col. 9, line 45; col. 17, lines 19 - 58).

Appellants disagree. Nowhere in the passages cited by the examiner does Silverman describe or suggest matching the order to a order of a market participant that has the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for the product, as recited in claim 6.

Claims 17-19

For the purpose of this appeal only Claims 17-19 stand or fall together. Claim 17 is representative of this group of claims.

Claim 17 depends from claim 6 and requires that “matching the order occurs based on a priority specified by the order.” However, this matching is the result of a market participant qualifying the order for avoidance of internalization execution. No combination of Stoll and Silverman match an order that avoided internalization execution in the electronic trading system according to a priority specified by the order.

**(7) Claims 2, 8, and 13 are not unpatentable over
Stoll in view of Silverman, and further in view of
Keith**

Claims 2, 8 and 13

For the purpose of this appeal only Claims 2, 8 and 13 stand or fall together. Claim 2 is representative of this group of claims.

It was shown *supra* that Stoll in view of Silverman neither describes nor suggests “...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system...” as recited in claim 1, from which claim 2 depends, and similarly in claims 7 and 12, from which claims 8 and 13 depend, respectively.

Keith fails to remedy the deficiencies of Stoll and Silverman. Keith was introduced by the examiner to cover the feature of matching-off the order against the quote of the matching market participant without regard to a priority of other quotes in the electronic-based trading system, against the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for a product specified by the order, as recited in claim 2, and similarly in claims 8 and 13.

Keith, however, neither describes nor suggests “...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization

execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system...,” as recited in claim 1, from which claim 2 depends.

**(8) Claims 4, 5, 9, and 10 are allowable over
Stoll in view of Silverman and Keith, and further
in view of Katz.**

Claims 4 and 5

For the purpose of this appeal only Claims 4, 5, 9 and 19 are argued separately with Claims 4 and 5 being representative of this group of claims.

The base claims are patentable over Stoll in view of Silverman and Keith as was argued above and Katz fails to cure the deficiencies of Stoll in view of Silverman. That is, Katz neither describes nor suggests at least “...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, ...”

In addition, claim 4, which is directed to “... calling a cancel request to cancel a quote at the side of the market in which a matched off order will be executed.” and claim 5, which is directed to “... calling a cancel request prior to matching off the order to cancel a quote at the side of the market at which an matched off order will be executed.” are neither described nor suggested by Katz.

Rather, Katz states:

According to one embodiment of the invention, there are three instances where an incoming limit order that cannot trade is not stored in the book memory 33. First, a limit order may contain special instructions that it should not be stored in the book memory 33. For example, if a limit order is designated as a fill-or-kill order, the order process 25 will delete the incoming order unless the entire size of the order can be traded against the orders and quotations in the book memory 33. Second, if a limit order is designated as an immediate-or-cancel order, the order process 25 will delete any portion of the incoming order that cannot trade against the orders and quotations in the book memory 33. Finally, according to this embodiment, a

professional limit order that cannot trade at a price that is within two trading increments below the best bid or above the best offer is deleted by the order process 25, that is, no portion of the professional limit order is traded.⁵⁴

Katz does not describe “a cancel request to cancel a quote at the side of the market in which a matched off order will be executed.” Katz, while clearly mentioning deleting an order does not call “a cancel request to delete the order as a result of a match off. Rather, Katz has limit orders with conditions such as fill or kill and the process automatically deletes the order if the conditions are not fulfilled.

(9) Claims 1-14 and 17-19 are not anticipated by Serkin.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 14

For the purpose of this appeal only Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 14 stand or fall together. Claim 1 is representative of this group of claims.

The examiner contends that Serkin discloses, in particular:

Re Claims 1-6 and 17: ...[C]hecking the order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system (Serkin, Figs. 1-9; abstract; [0001] - [0090]) ...⁵⁵

Again, the examiner has merely cited the entire specification of Serkin *sans* the claims, and the comments from the beginning of Subsection (4) above apply here as well.

Serkin neither describes nor suggests “...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to

⁵⁴ Katz, Column 10, Lines 40-58.

⁵⁵ Final Office Action, Mail Date 31 October 2007, Page 12

execution of an order if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system...”

Nowhere in the specification of Serkin does Serkin describe or suggest “...checking the order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system,...,” as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 8, 10, and 13

For the purpose of this appeal only claims 2, 3, 8, 10, and 13 stand or fall together. Claim 2 is representative of this group of claims.

It was shown *supra* that Serkin neither describes nor suggests “...checking [an] order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution ... if the market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system...” as recited in claim 1, from which claim 2 depends.

Serkin, in addition fails to teach: “if a market participant has not qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution.”

Claims 6 and 11

For the purpose of this appeal only Claims 6 and 11 stand or fall together. Claim 6 is representative of this group of claims.

Serkin neither describes nor suggests “...matching the order to a order of a market participant that has the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for the product... if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution.”

Nowhere in the specification of Serkin does Serkin describe or suggest if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution.

Claims 17-19

For the purpose of this appeal only Claims 17-19 stand or fall together. Claim 17 is representative of this group of claims.

Claim 17 depends from claim 6 and requires that “matching the order occurs based on a priority specified by the order. “ However, this matching is the result of a market participant qualifying the order for avoidance of internalization execution. Serkin neither describes nor suggests matching of an order that was qualified to avoid internalization execution in the electronic trading system, and therefore Serkin does not suggest matching that order, which was qualified to avoid internalization execution according to a priority specified by the order.

Conclusion

Therefore, the Examiner erred in rejecting Appellant's claims and should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 6, 2009

/Denis G. Maloney/
Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

22064925

Appendix of Claims

1. A computer implemented method of processing an order in an electronic-based trading system, the method comprises:

receiving an order to buy or sell a product, the order having a market participant identification; for the order,

checking the order in a computer to determine if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution for the order in the electronic-based trading system, where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system. and

satisfying the order according to whether or not the market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of internalization execution.

2. The method of claim 1 wherein if a market participant has not qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution, the method further comprises:

checking if a market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the electronic-based trading system which is at the best bid or best offer price in the electronic-based trading system; and if there is a match,

matching-off the order against the quote of the matching market participant without regard to a priority of other quotes in the electronic-based trading system, against the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for a product specified by the order.

3. The method of claim 2, wherein the priority is price-time and the method further comprises:

matching-off the order without regard to a time priority of other quotes in the electronic-based trading system.

4. The method of claim 2 further comprising:
calling a cancel request to cancel a quote at the side of the market in which a matched off order will be executed.

5. The method of claim 2 further comprising:
calling a cancel request prior to matching off the order to cancel a quote at the side of the market at which an matched off order will be executed.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution, the method further comprises:

matching the order to a order of a market participant that has the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for the product.

7. A networked computer system for providing an electronic-based market system comprises:

one or more networked computers to

receive orders and match orders against quotes posted in the system on a time priority basis;

check if a market participant identification associated with a received order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system; and

check if the market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of the internalization execution for the order in the market system where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order where the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system; and

match the order with quotes in the system according to whether the order is qualified for avoidance of the internalization execution.

8. The system of claim 7 wherein if a market participant has not qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution, the system:

checks if a market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system which is at the best bid or best offer price in the system; and if there is a match,

matches-off the order against the quote of the matching market participant without regard to a priority of other quotes in the system, against the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for a product specified by the order.

9. The system of claim 7 wherein the system calls a cancel request to cancel a quote at the side of the market in which a matched off order will be executed.

10. The system of claim 8 wherein the system calls a cancel request prior to matching off the order to cancel a quote at the side of the market at which an matched off order will be executed.

11. The system of claim 7 wherein if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution, the system matches the order to a order of a market participant that has the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of the market.

12. A computer program product residing on a computer readable medium for operating an electronic based trading system comprises instructions for causing a computer to:

receive an order from a market participant's customer; and for the order,

check if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution in the electronic based trading system where internalization execution corresponds to execution of an order if the market participant identification associated the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system that is at the best bid or best offer price in the system regardless of the priority of that quote in the system;

match the order according to whether or not the market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of internalization execution.

13. The computer program of claim 12 further comprises instructions to:

check if a market participant identification associated with the order matches a market participant identification representing a quote in the system which is at the best bid or best offer price in the system, if a market participant has not qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution; and if there is a match,

match-off the order against the quote of the matching market participant without regard to a priority of other quotes in the system, against the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of a market for a product specified by the order.

14. The computer program product of claim 12 further comprises instructions to:

match the order to a order of a market participant that has the one of the best bid or best offer that is at the opposite side of the market if a market participant has qualified the order for avoidance of an internalization execution.

15-16 (Canceled)

17. The method of claim 6 wherein matching the order occurs based on a priority specified by the order.

18. The system of claim 11 wherein the system matches the order based on a priority specified by the order.

Applicant : John F. Malitzis
Serial No. : 10/040,912
Filed : January 7, 2002
Page : 36 of 38

Attorney's Docket No.: 09857-0086001

19. The computer program product of claim 11 wherein the instructions cause the computer to match the order based on a priority specified by the order.

Applicant : John F. Malitzis
Serial No. : 10/040,912
Filed : January 7, 2002
Page : 37 of 38

Attorney's Docket No.: 09857-0086001

Evidence Appendix

NONE

Applicant : John F. Malitzis
Serial No. : 10/040,912
Filed : January 7, 2002
Page : 38 of 38

Attorney's Docket No.: 09857-0086001

Related Proceedings Appendix

NONE